

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

NATIONAL ASSET CONSULTANTS LLC,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	
	)	No. 1:18-cv-01616-TWP-DML
MIDWEST HOLDINGS-INDIANAPOLIS, LLC,	)	
F.C. TUCKER COMPANY, INC.,	)	
SARI MANDRESH, DAVID HENNESSY,	)	
and VICKIE YASER,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ENTRY ON JURISDICTION**

It has come to the Court’s attention that Plaintiff’s Complaint fails to allege all of the facts necessary to determine whether this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case. The Complaint alleges that this Court has jurisdiction based upon diversity of citizenship. However, the Complaint fails to sufficiently allege the citizenship of Defendant F.C. Tucker Company, Inc. Citizenship is the operative consideration for jurisdictional purposes. *See Meyerson v. Harrah’s East Chicago Casino*, 299 F.3d 616, 617 (7th Cir. 2002) (“residence and citizenship are not synonyms and it is the latter that matters for purposes of the diversity jurisdiction”).

The citizenship of a corporation is “both the state of incorporation and the state in which the corporation has its principal place of business.” *Westfield Ins. Co. v. Kuhns*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 138262, at \*3 (S.D. Ind. Nov. 30, 2011). Thus, the complaint or notice of removal must allege both the state of incorporation and the state of the party’s principal place of business. *Illinois v. Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp.*, 677 F.2d 571, 578 n.13 (7th Cir. 1982).

The Complaint alleges that “F.C. Tucker Company, Inc. is a for profit corporation, whose state of incorporation is Indiana. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1), F.C. Tucker Company, Inc.

is a citizen of the state of Indiana as Indiana is its state of incorporation.” ([Filing No. 1 at 2.](#)) These allegations are insufficient because they fail to identify the principal place of business of Defendant F.C. Tucker Company, Inc., and that information is necessary for the Court to determine whether it has jurisdiction.

Therefore, the Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to file a Supplemental Jurisdictional Statement that establishes the Court’s jurisdiction over this case. This statement should specifically identify principal place of business of Defendant F.C. Tucker Company, Inc. This jurisdictional statement is due **fourteen (14) days** from the date of this Entry.

**SO ORDERED.**

Date: 5/30/2018



TANYA WALTON PRATT, JUDGE  
United States District Court  
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

Andrew A. Ault  
AULT LAW OFFICE, LLC  
andrewaultlaw@gmail.com